

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 11, 14, 15, 19 and 21 are now present in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the personal interview which was conducted on March 31, 2011. An Examiner Interview Summary was made of record as Paper No. 20110331.

During the interview, Applicant's representative explained the term "broadcasting" using the disclosure in the background section of the application. Applicant's representative emphasized why the cited prior art does not teach "broadcasting" a connection request, as well as a connection process completion command, and connection counterpart notifying means.

The Examiner agreed that Fingerhut and Hunzinger references do not teach these claimed features, but requested that "broadcasting" be clarified in the claims. Also, the Examiner requested that "first incoming one set..." be changed to "earliest incoming one set."

The claims have been amended in the manner discussed during the interview, and are believed to place the application into condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fingerhut (6,418,129), in view of Hunzinger (2002/0062467), and further in view of Kim, et al. (7,139,014). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Fingerhut and Hunzinger do not teach communicating with base units by broadcasting

As can be seen in Fig. 9 of the present application, an example embodiment of the present invention includes that a TV main unit 3 communicates by broadcasting commands. At step S512, TV main unit 3 broadcasts a transmit connection request command to wireless centers 2a and 2b within a communication range of the TV main unit. At step S514, TV main unit 3 broadcasts a transmit connection completion command to the wireless centers 2a and 2b within a communication range.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify this aspect of the disclosed invention. Claim 1 recites, among other things,

“a wireless terminal...comprising:

connection requesting means for, when there are a plurality of base devices in a communications range of the wireless terminal, broadcasting to the plurality of base devices, a connection request command that requests a connection with a base device;” and

“connection completion notifying means for, after the receiving of the earliest incoming set of identification data, broadcasting to the plurality of base devices, a connection process completion command that indicates that the connection with the connected base device is established; “

The Examiner presented an argument that “although the connection request includes a specific base station, as indicated by the Activation-Request Packet (Field 26 of Figure 3), the specific base station is still a base station.”

Applicant submits that the connection request to a specific base station indicated by the Activation-Request Packet does not teach the claimed broadcasting a connection request command, as defined in claim 1, as amended.

In a similar manner, Applicant submits that Hunzinger’s alleged teaching of “to confirm a delivery of content transmitted from a gateway device, a mobile device sends a delivery confirmation acknowledgment (C-ACK) message to said gateway device,” does not teach the claimed broadcasting a connection process completion command.

Kim does not teach the claimed connection counterpart notifying means

Claim 1 further recites “the connection counterpart notifying means displaying the identification data of the connected base device on the display section in an OSD manner.”

Applicant had presented an argument that neither Hunzinger nor Kim disclose this claimed feature.

In the section “Response to Arguments,” the Examiner alleges that “Kim teaches a portable terminal displays video information in an OSD manner, identifying images based on information transmitted from a server, as indicated in Column 1, lines 41-43 and 49-53, Column 2, lines 2-4 and Column 4, lines 20-32.”

Applicant submits that the section of Kim at column 2, lines 2-4, added by the Examiner, merely states that “The server is connected to the mobile communication network and provides transmission/reception service of image data over the mobile communication network.” The “image data” is described in Kim as being images obtained by a digital camera (see Kim at column 1, lines 26-37).

Applicant submits that even if the Examiner’s argument is true, claim 1 does not recite “identifying images based on information transmitted from a server.” Rather the claimed “identification data” is of “the connected base device.”

At least for these reasons, Applicant submits that Fingerhut, Hunzinger and Kim, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every claimed feature recited in claim 1, as amended. This deficiency applies as well to respective dependent claims. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11, 14, 15 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fingerhut (6,418,129), in view of Hunzinger (2002/0062467), and further in view of Yoon (2004/0227692). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner’s rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Fingerhut and Hunzinger do not teach communicating with base units by broadcasting

As noted above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that Fingerhut fails to teach a wireless terminal having “connection requesting means for, when there are a plurality of base devices in a communications range of the wireless terminal, broadcasting to the plurality of base devices, a connection request command that requests a connection with a base device,” and that Hunzinger fails to disclose “connection completion notifying means for, after the receiving of the first earliest incoming set of identification data, broadcasting to the plurality of base devices, a connection process completion command that indicates that the connection with the connected base device is established.”

Fingerhut, Hunzinger, as well as Yoon fail to teach the claimed warning means

Claim 11 recites “warning means for warning the user if the connection confirmation means does not obtain the connection confirmation command within a predetermined time after the transition to the connection confirmation mode.”

The Examiner relies on Yoon for teaching this claimed feature. In particular, the Examiner alleges that Yoon teaches:

“Based upon a user selection, a user of a wireless terminal receives a warning signal in an OSD manner when the connection is lost during a predetermined period after the establishment of a connection, and said user continually receives a returned check signal as a confirmation of a good signal during said predetermined period,” with reference to paragraphs 27, 28, 34, 36-38.

Yoon is directed to a computer system that can be connected to at least one other display device. (Abstract). At paragraph [0018], Yoon discloses a step of “determining whether the I/O ports of the main body are connected with the at least one external display device.” Then at paragraph [0019], Yoon discloses a step of “displaying a warning message on the first display device, if the I/O ports are not connected to the at least one external display device.”

The aspect mentioned in paragraph [0019] is described in paragraph [0038], which states:

“if the control part 15 determines that the main body 1 is not connected to any external display device 3, a warning message, such as “No connection with the external display device” is displayed on a display panel of the first display device 2, typically in the form of a dialog box provided in a graphical user interface (GUI) window or in the form of an OSD (On Screen Display) message.”

In paragraph [0037], Yoon describes the connection check as “The control part 15 transmits a check signal from the pin and receives a returned check signal from the pin, thereby checking whether the second display device 3 connection is formed.”

With regard to the flowchart in Figs. 3A to 3C, Yoon discloses that at operation 49, the control part 15 determines whether a selection signal is generated, wherein the selection signal makes the selected picture be displayed on the external display device 3. If determined, at operation 31, that at least one external display device 3 is not connected with the connector(s) provided in the main body 1, typically, at operation 39, a warning message is output on a display panel of the first display device. (Yoon at paragraphs [0040] and [0041]).

Thus, based on a careful reading of the disclosure in Yoon, it can be seen that Yoon does not teach “based on a user selection, a user of a wireless terminal receives a warning signal in an OSD manner when a connection is lost during a predetermined period after the establishment of a connection.” For example, Yoon does not disclose a wireless connection to a display device. Yoon does not disclose determining whether communication is lost during a predetermined period of time after establishment of a connection.

Instead, Yoon teaches checking a pin after a selection signal is generated.

At least for these reasons, Applicant submits that Yoon fails to make up for deficiencies in Fingerhut and Hunzinger, as Yoon also fails to teach at least the claimed “warning means for warning the user if the connection confirmation means does not obtain the connection confirmation command within a predetermined time after the transition to the connection confirmation mode.”

At least for these reasons, Applicant submits that Fingerhut, Hunzinger, Yoon, and Kim, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every claimed feature recited in claim 11, as amended. This deficiency applies as well to respective dependent claims. Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant(s) therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant(s) believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert W. Downs**, Registration No. 48222, at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: May 16, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48222
Michael R. Cammarata *Robert Downs*
Registration No.: 39491
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000